```
1
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                     WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                     )
                                     ) Case No. 1:17-CR-00190
 4
                                                    (RJA) (MJR)
                     Plaintiff,
                                    )
 5
                                     ) July 27th, 2022
    VS.
 6
                                     ) 2:38 p.m.
    G. STEVEN PIGEON,
 7
                     Defendant.
                                    )
 8
 9
                        TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD J. ARCARA
10
                  SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
    APPEARANCES:
12
    For the Plaintiff:
                         TRINI E. ROSS, ESQ.
13
                          UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
                          BY: PAUL BONNANO, ESQ.
14
                          ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
                          138 Delaware Avenue
                          Buffalo, NY 14202
15
16
                          U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
                          BY: JOHN DIXON KELLER, ESQ.
17
                          1400 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 12000
                          Washington, DC 20005
18
    For the Defendant:
                         LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP
19
                               PAUL CAMBRIA, ESQ.
                          BY:
                               JUSTIN GINTER, ESQ.
                          42 Delaware Avenue, Suite 120
20
                          Buffalo, NY 14202
21
    Probation Officer:
                         TINA BLACKMAN
22
    Court Reporter:
                          MEGAN E. PELKA, RPR
23
                          Robert H. Jackson US Courthouse
                          2 Niagara Square
24
                          Buffalo, NY 14202
                          (716) 364-6449
25
```

THE CLERK: This is case 17-CR-190. United States v. 1 02:38PM 2 G. Steven Pigeon. Sentencing. Counsel, please state your 02:38PM name and the party you represent for the record. 3 02:38PM 02:38PM 4 MR. KELLER: John Keller and Paul Bonnano on behalf 5 of the government, Your Honor. 02:38PM 6 MR. CAMBRIA: Paul Cambria and Justin Ginter on 02:38PM behalf of the defendant, Your Honor. 7 02:38PM 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon, gentlemen. Are we ready 02:38PM to proceed? 9 02:38PM 10 MR. KELLER: Yes, Your Honor. Before we proceed, I 02:38PM 11 just wanted to place on the record that the parties, prior to 02:38PM 02:39PM 12 sentencing this afternoon, had an opportunity to discuss with 13 the Court some previous filings that had been filed under 02:39PM The Court permitted the parties an opportunity to file 02:39PM 14 15 those publicly so that all of the relevant facts are in the 02:39PM public record. We appreciate the Court's indulgence and are 16 02:39PM 17 ready to move forward. 02:39PM 18 MR. CAMBRIA: Yes. I agree with that, Your Honor. 02:39PM 02:39PM 19 We're sorry for the delay, but we appreciate the opportunity 20 you gave us to file those matters. 02:39PM 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're ready to 02:39PM 22 proceed. 02:39PM The defendant, Steven Pigeon, stands before the Court on 23 02:39PM 24 his previous plea of guilty to one count of conspiracy to 02:39PM 25 cause a donation of \$25,000 or more to be made by a foreign 02:39PM

national to a campaign in connection with a state election in 02:39PM 1 violation of Title 52, United States Code, Section 30121 and 2 02:39PM 30109(d)(1)(A)(i); all in violation of Title 18, United States 3 02:40PM Code, Section 371. I know that counsel have had an 02:40PM 4 5 opportunity to review the report and I assume, Mr. Cambria, 02:40PM 6 you've had a chance to review the report with your client. 02:40PM 7 MR. CAMBRIA: Yes, I have. 02:40PM 8 THE COURT: The Court hereby accepts the terms and 02:40PM 9 conditions of the plea agreement and the plea of guilty to 02:40PM 10 conspiracy to cause a donation of \$25,000 or more to be made 02:40PM 11 by a foreign national to a campaign in connection with a state 02:40PM 02:40PM 12 election. I will place the report in the record under seal. 13 If an appeal is filed, counsel on appeal will be permitted 02:40PM 14 access to the sealed report, except that counsel on appeal 02:40PM 15 will not be permitted access to the recommendation section. 02:40PM 16 The parties have filed the appropriate statement of 02:40PM 17 parties with respect to sentencing factors. There's no 02:40PM 18 dispute about the facts contained in the report and, therefor, 02:40PM 02:40PM 19 the Court adopts these facts as its findings of fact and 20 hereby incorporates them in the record. There are no 02:41PM 21 objections to the probation officer's conclusions as to the 02:41PM 22 applicable guidelines. 02:41PM 23 The report recommends that the defendant's base offense 02:41PM level under Guideline Section 2X1.1 and 2C1.8(a) is 8. 24 02:41PM

also recommends that because, under Guideline Section

25

02:41PM

2C1.8(b)(1), the value of the illegal transaction exceeded 02:41PM 1 \$5,500, specifically \$25,000, a four-level upward adjustment 2 02:41PM 3 pursuant to Guideline Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(C) applies, as the 02:41PM loss was greater than 15,000 but not more than \$40,000. 02:41PM 4 5 report also recommends a two-level upward adjustment pursuant 02:41PM 6 to Guideline Section 2C1.8(b)(2)(A), as the offense involved 02:41PM 7 an illegal transaction made or received from a foreign 02:41PM 8 national. 02:42PM 9

02:42PM

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The report also recommends a two-level downward adjustment based upon the defendant's acceptance of responsibility and accordingly recommends the offense level should be properly calculated at level 12, and the criminal history category should be properly calculated as category I.

Under this calculation, the advisory range for imprisonment is 10 to 16 months. The statutory term of imprisonment is a maximum of five years. The advisory guideline range for supervised release is a term of one to three years. The advisory range for a fine is 3,000 to \$30,000 plus the cost of imprisonment and supervised release.

In accordance with the Supreme Court decision in U.S. v. Booker and the Second Circuit decision in U.S. v. Crosby, this Court must consider the quidelines, is not bound by them. The Court must also consider the factors set forth in 18 USC 3553(a).

Now, the government has moved for a four-level downward

departure pursuant to 5K1.1. I've reviewed the government's 02:43PM 1 motion, and the Court finds it should be granted, and the 2 02:43PM 3 applicable guideline range shall be reduced by four levels. 02:43PM 02:43PM 4 So, the offense level now is 8 and a range of -- zero to six 5 months of imprisonment is now the guideline range. 02:43PM 6 I am in receipt of 13 character letters submitted on 02:43PM 7 behalf of the defendant, the defendant's sentencing 02:43PM 8 memorandum, and the government's sentencing memorandum, which 02:43PM I have reviewed and considered, and I've considered all the 9 02:43PM 10 filings by counsel. I think with that, I think that pretty 02:43PM 11 much sets forth the parameters here. Mr. Cambria or 02:43PM 02:43PM 12 Mr. Ginter, whoever. 13 MR. CAMBRIA: Yes. Your Honor would like me to be --02:43PM 14 THE COURT: Whatever you feel. It doesn't make any 02:43PM 15 difference. 02:43PM 16 MR. CAMBRIA: Thank you, Your Honor. A number of 02:43PM 17 things. As is your habit, based on my prior long experience 02:43PM 18 in appearing before you, I know that you have read everything 02:44PM 02:44PM 19 that's been submitted by both sides and all of the character 20 letters and so long that have been submitted by the defense. 02:44PM 21 The government is asking for you to sentence my client to 02:44PM 22 six months of incarceration. We're asking you to give him a 02:44PM 23 probationary sentence. And there's a reason -- there's 02:44PM several reasons for that. 24 02:44PM 25 First of all, there's reference made by the government to 02:44PM

02:44PM

02:44PM

02:45PM

02:46PM

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the charges that are in the state court. Clearly, this Court should not punish my client based on those charges since that sentencing will occur tomorrow. And what, if any, punishment should arise from that will be decided in that forum by another judge. And so, there shouldn't be a double penalty, if you will, as a result of that.

I think the things that are important to consider are the

I think the things that are important to consider are the following. The government says, of course you need to make an example. These events which underlie these charges are serious, and such that there has to be a message sent, if you will, that, you know, acts like this will not be tolerated.

Well, first and foremost, by pleading guilty, my client has already sentenced -- partially sentenced himself because, obviously, he now has a felony record. And in addition to that, he has had to give up his license as an attorney, and is not in a position, as a result of entering that plea, of practicing, basically, what he has done for employment for many, many years.

So, already, he has certainly paid a very high price and penalty for his conduct. What's of note is that he readily admitted his conduct. He readily admitted the wrongful nature of his conduct. He makes no excuses for it. He has made no excuses for that conduct. He's accepted that responsibility. So, in addition -- so, probation. Some people take that lightly and think that that's not a significant sentence.

It's a very significant sentence because, basically, your life 02:46PM 1 is controlled. You have to report. You have to account. 2 02:47PM You have curfews. You have a lot of different things that 02:47PM 3 02:47PM 4 interfere with your day-to-day life and, obviously, punish 5 02:47PM you. 6 In addition to that, Your Honor, over five years my client 02:47PM 7 has been under supervision, pretrial supervision. 02:47PM

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:47PM

02:48PM

has been under supervision, pretrial supervision. And so, over five years, his life has been restricted. It's been restricted significantly where he can travel, what he can do, et cetera. So, besides losing his profession, losing his license, losing his ability to practice the business that he practiced for many years, he's been under constant supervision with no demerits, if you will, to that supervision for over five years.

And so, I submit that a significant message is sent out as a result of all of that. Somebody analyzing this case, they're going to say, well, for a \$25,000 contribution by a Canadian individual, this man has given up basically his liberty for over five years. If he's placed on probation, it would be additional years.

He's given up his profession. He now is a felon. He has readily admitted all of these things. And so, I submit that is a significant punishment. And so -- and not some light punishment. And I submit that that is sufficient but not excessive, which the statute, of course, deals with.

On page 5 of the prosecution's submission, they cite a 1 02:48PM couple cases there and try to basically say, well, in similar 2 02:49PM 3 cases, look at the sentence that's been imposed. Those cases 02:49PM are not similar. The individuals and their activity are 02:49PM 4 5 different than my client, significantly different. And so, I 02:49PM 6 suggest that they are not in any way something that should be 02:49PM 7 a guiding light, if you will, with regard to this. 02:49PM 8 THE COURT: Mr. Cambria, I have a tendency to agree 02:49PM with you on that. Many times, in this courtroom, I've had 9 02:49PM

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02:49PM

02:49PM

02:49PM

02:50PM

THE COURT: Mr. Cambria, I have a tendency to agree with you on that. Many times, in this courtroom, I've had cases where counsel on a different side for, let's say a more lenient sentence, defense counsel will cite other cases of other judges imposing sentences under allegedly similar circumstances.

My question to counsel is always like, well, have you read the presentence report from the other individuals? And the answer is obviously going to be no. And I said, well, how do you know what factors that judge considered in imposing sentence; because I am not familiar with that particular case or what factors the judge considered in imposing those sentences; because I haven't had access to the report.

So, I don't find it very helpful, a lot of times, when you do cite other cases with similar sentences or appears to be similar sentences because, in sentencing, as you are fully aware, Mr. Cambria, there's a lot of factors that a court must take a look at in trying to impose the sentence; considering

02:50PM

02:50PM

02:51PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the guidelines, considering the 3553 factors, in imposing a sentence that is fair and reasonable, which is subject to review. Particularly if there's an appeal made, and a higher court takes a look at what the sentence should be, the higher court would say was this sentence reasonable. And the Second Circuit -- I know because I read all their opinions -- is constantly looking at sentences to see whether or not they're reasonable.

So, even though the government has cited other cases, I don't know what the background of those cases were, what the factors were, because I haven't head the presentence report nor do I know anything about the case other than what's in the written decision that is being cited here.

So, I certainly have read those cases. I'm aware of those cases, but are they really helpful? I don't think they are as helpful as counsel, the government in this case, may think they are, because I don't know all the details. I don't know any details other than what's in the decision. So, I will give it the appropriate consideration just so you're aware.

MR. CAMBRIA: I appreciate that. Your Honor, a couple other points. Certain aspects of the consequences that he has already suffered are lifetime. Felony conviction is lifetime. Loss of law license, lifetime. Loss of the ability to practice his profession, lifetime. As opposed to six months in jail, once it's over it's over, he already has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:52PM

02:53PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

02:54PM

several punishments in place that will be with him for his life. And so, the other thing that the cases and the statute talked about is deterrence. There isn't a chance in the world that this man would repeat any of the conduct that he has so readily admitted here.

And no one who looks at this case objectively -- and if you were to sentence him to a probationary term or something other than that other than incarceration -- there isn't anyone who could look at this case and say, oh, well, that was easy. There's nothing easy when you lose basically things that were near and dear and necessary to your life for your entire life. And that's what's happened.

I think it's important that he admitted his guilt. This isn't after a trial and after a finding and after a claim, oh, this didn't happen and I'm innocent and so on. None of that happened here. He readily admitted this. Probation report reflects that. He's had no infractions in all the years that he's been under supervision. So, I submit to Your Honor that, plus a number of things that were brought out in his character letters. Obviously, he's an individual who had no reputation issues prior to the events that occurred here.

So, I ask you, given all of that, and given all of the penalties that have already been felt but will remain with him, that a sentence other than incarceration would be fair, would not be too little and it would not be too much. I

appreciate your time, Your Honor thank you. 02:54PM 1 THE COURT: You can be seated. 2 02:55PM 3 MR. CAMBRIA: You want him to speak? 02:55PM 02:55PM 4 THE COURT: Yes. I'll hear from you. You can be seated there or whatever you want to do, Mr. Pigeon, whatever 5 02:55PM 6 is more comfortable. 02:55PM 7 Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. THE DEFENDANT: 02:55PM I just 8 wanted to say that I do accept responsibility for my actions 02:55PM and am very sorry for them. I also appreciate the time and 9 02:55PM 10 consideration that I know you've put into reviewing this case 02:55PM 11 and I just wanted to thank you for that, and let you know that 02:55PM that is what I'm thinking. Thank you. 02:55PM 12 13 MR. KELLER: Thank you. Your Honor, this sentencing 02:55PM is about illegal influence on our elections and about 02:55PM 14 15 corruption of our elected officials. Our government serves 02:56PM the interest of this country, the United States of America. 16 02:56PM 17 We don't serve the interest of a foreign nation or foreign 02:56PM 18 corporation or foreign national. Our elected officials are 02:56PM 02:56PM 19 entrusted to represent the best interest of the communities 20 that they serve, their constituents, not foreign nationals, 02:56PM 21 and not individuals who have demonstrated willingness to try 02:56PM 22 to illegally influence them. 02:56PM 23 The defendant repeatedly sought to illegally influence our 02:56PM government through the election, through bribery of an elected 24 02:56PM 25 state court judge, putting the financial interests of his 02:56PM

02:56PM

02:56PM

02:57PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

clients and himself before the best interest of the communities that these governments are supposed to serve, that these institutions are supposed to serve.

The defendant spent a career in politics. He knows the law. He knows the rule. He knows the ideals that our democracy is supposed to uphold. And yet, he has repeatedly broken the law and undermined those ideals, shaking public confidence in the security of our elections that they are secure from foreign influence, that they are valid; shaking public confidence in the principle that public officials will serve their community with the community's best interest in mind, and not be beholden to those with the means and the willingness to illegally influence them.

Mr. Cambria made a comment that the Court should not consider the pending sentencing the defendant -- or the offense conduct underlying the pending sentencing for the defendant in state court involving his bribery of a state court judge, but 3553(a) requires the Court to consider the history and characteristics of the defendant, in this context especially, when we're dealing with the corruption of government institutions.

The fact that he has demonstrated a history of willingness to corrupt our government institutions is highly relevant, and the Court should consider that as it impacts the appropriate sentence to be imposed here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:58PM

02:59PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

This is not a garden-variety white collar offense or a mere regulatory matter. The defendant's conduct promotes a dangerous cynicism that our government is not for the people by the people; it is, instead, up for sale to be bought by those with access and means and willingness to skirt the law for the best interest of a few instead of the interest of the many.

Because of the seriousness of the offense, Your Honor, a term of imprisonment is appropriate here. The government certainly concedes that the guideline range is zero to six months, and that a sentence within that range would be reasonable, and sentences within that range would include non-custodial probationary sentences.

And the government also takes the Court's point that every defendant is different. Sentencing is a very individualized process, and each case is different. But the sentences imposed on other defendants who have engaged in similar conduct, illegal contributions in state and federal elections, those sentences reflect a consensus on the Court that this conduct is serious and needs to be deterred, and needs to be responded to, and addressed appropriately.

And though, certainly, Mr. Pigeon is distinguishable in some ways from those defendants, and has accepted responsibility here, his conduct, his offense conduct, is not all that distinguishable, and his history and characteristics

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:00PM

03:01PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are distinguishable in a way that does not benefit him.

Deterrence is important here, as the Court is aware, not just specific deterrence for Mr. Pigeon, but general deterrence for others who are watching; for others who are considering whether to put the financial interest of themselves and their clients ahead of our governmental interests; ahead of the principles that underlie our democracy; those that are watching to see how seriously the Court takes this type of conduct. General deterrence is just as important as specific deterrence here and weighs in favor of a custodial sentence.

Your Honor, there aren't that many instances, fortunately, of convictions for making foreign contributions in our domestic elections. And that's a good thing that we can all be thankful for. But that is all the more reason that when there are instances of defendants facilitating foreign influence on our domestic public officials, that it needs to be addressed and responded to with appropriate severity. In this case, that means a six-month sentence of imprisonment at the high end of the guideline range. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You know, I always thought that before I became a judge that, boy, it's going to be a pretty easy job.

It's just -- particularly in my past life, I said that it would be a piece of cake. Just go in there and just sentence the people whatever I felt would be a good sentence. And

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:02PM

03:03PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

before the guidelines went into effect, which I was a judge prior to the guidelines going into effect and then after the guidelines went into effect.

I remember back and I had occasion to testify a couple of times before the US Sentencing Commission. And I remember the first time I did, there was were a number of judges sitting in the hearing room. And I was getting -- and I was then a proponent for the guidelines. And I can remember all those judges kind of giving me the evil eye, like what are you doing? We don't really want these guidelines. We don't want them. And then, up to the present time, I think that particularly except for maybe mandatory minimum sentences that were imposed that we have come to work within the guidelines.

And I remember about three or four years ago, I was at a judges' workshop, about 300 judges there, and it was amazing how all the judges there -- and almost to the -- everyone I talked to and everyone from the conversations that were occurring and the presentations that were occurring, the judges there -- and I can say this unanimously almost -- felt that the guidelines were -- thank God they're there, and they couldn't imagine a sentencing procedure where the guidelines would not be there.

And I was quite surprised because it's like a 100 percent reversal of the way the courts thought about the guidelines back in 1987, '88. The guidelines have worked through the

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:04PM

03:05PM

03:06PM

03:06PM

03:06PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

system and, I think, as I said, I think everyone has come to accept them. Is it a perfect system? No. Originally, they were mandatory.

And I remember having breakfast with Justice Scalia, and it was only about six of us in the room. And he says, you know, these guidelines — they were mandatory then. He says, these guidelines really are guidelines. And I said, it sounds like I'm talking to Judge Elfvin, because he always was a prior judge here who always talked about the guidelines should be guidelines, not mandatory. Well, the Supreme Court changed all that and Justice Scalia wrote the opinion making the guidelines no longer mandatory.

So, we've gone through this whole process and you would think over the years -- and I don't think there's been more litigation in any area of law, both at the district court level and at the circuit court level, more than the guidelines. It seems to have somewhat tapered off as far as circuit court decisions, but there's been a lot written and a lot of decisions on guidelines.

And you would think that over the years it would get simpler and easier for judges. Well, if the last week is any indication of the opposite of that that I have experienced, this has, like, been a week from hell for me as far as the guidelines are concerned imposing sentences. I've never had -- spent more time in reading presentence reports,

03:06PM

03:07PM

03:08PM

03:08PM

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

submission by counsel in imposing sentence than I have this 1 week. And that's good. That's my job. My job is to take the 2 time to read everything, and I do read everything. And as I 3 said earlier, contrary to what I thought it would be easy, 4 5 it's not easy. And it's not -- and if it ever becomes easy, 6 then I think I should immediately retire. I suppose that 7 would make a lot of people happy if I did, but I don't intend 8 to, because I love what I do. And I learn every day. 9

And every case I look at, obviously every case that we have, that doesn't run into many of the factors that cases such as this have. There's a lot of factors here that individuals have -- a lot of things to consider, especially where you're considering the guidelines which are, again, guidelines, but you consider other factors.

And it's not an easy job, and it's something that I take very seriously. And I certainly try, to the best of my ability considering all the factors, try to be as impartial as I can be, which I think I am to a large degree, being as fair as I can be. And I do the best I can. Again, I'm not perfect and -- but I try to administer the justice as best I can.

This case is certainly -- I've read a lot of -- I read the submissions of the parties which, basically, have now been on file and available. I read all the letters, which are now on file, which are available, and they are certainly helpful.

The report is helpful, but also all the submissions by counsel

are helpful. So, with that, you know I've spent an enormous 03:08PM 1 2 amount of time and spent some time here today in preparing all 03:08PM the guidelines. 03:08PM 3 03:08PM 4 I'd like to take a couple minutes just to reflect on what's been said here in court. I think it would be very 5 03:08PM 6 difficult, many times, to have the guidelines, read all the 03:08PM 7 reports, come into court, listen carefully to counsel, and not 03:08PM 8 giving counsel -- what they say in court as well as the 03:08PM defendant -- what is being said here, some consideration. 9 03:08PM 10 Obviously, I'm not going to take a long time, because I'm 03:08PM 11 pretty familiar with everything, but I want to reflect for a 03:08PM 03:09PM 12 few minutes on what was said here today. So, I'm going to 13 take a short break and I'll be back within five minutes or so. 03:09PM Court will be in recess. 03:09PM 14 15 THE CLERK: All rise. 03:09PM (Brief recess from 3:09 p.m. to 3:20 p.m.) 16 03:09PM 17 THE CLERK: All rise. You may be seated. 03:09PM 18 Good afternoon again, gentlemen. 03:20PM THE COURT: 03:20PM 19 Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it's the 20 judge of the Court that the defendant, Steven Pigeon, is 03:20PM hereby committed to the custody of Bureau of Prisons to be 21 03:21PM 22 imprisoned for a period of four months. Cost of incarceration 03:21PM fee is waived. 23 03:21PM Upon release, he shall be placed on supervised release for 24 03:21PM 25 one year; shall report in person to the probation office in 03:21PM

03:22PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the district in which he is released within 72 hours; shall comply with the standard conditions of supervised release adopted by the Court. He shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; shall be prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous device; shall not possess a controlled substance.

Since the instant offense occurred after September 1994, however, is not related to illegal substances, and he does not have a history of substance abuse problem, mandatory requirement for drug testing is waived. He shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as required by the Justice For All Act of 2004. He shall submit to a search of his person, property, vehicle, place of residence, or any other property under his control and permit the confiscation of any evidence or contraband discovered.

The Court finds he does not have the ability to pay a fine; however, I will order the mandatory special assessment of \$100 which is due immediately. Payment shall can begin under the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial Responsibility Program.

In determining the sentence, the Court has considered the advisory guideline range and all the arguments raised by the defendant, counsel, as well as the government as to what the appropriate sentence should be. In addition, I have carefully considered the factors in 18 USC 3553(a) and finds the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

03:22PM

03:22PM

03:22PM

03:23PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

sentence imposed is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purpose of sentencing set forth in 18 USC Section 3553(a)(2). Although I'm not bound to, I have imposed a sentence a little bit above the midrange.

The Court notes that Mr. Pigeon is 61 years old, generally, in good health, had no history of mental health issues, no substance abuse. He is well-educated, having obtained a Bachelor Degree in Political Science and a Juris Doctorate and having passed the bar examinations in both New York and the State of Florida; however, he is no longer able to practice law. He owes a significant amount of money in back taxes and a personal debt.

His family has a history in politics. His aunt has described him as a people pleaser, and noted that he entered politics to help people. The Court has received letters from highly respected and prominent individuals in the community. In those letters, his friends and colleagues noted his intelligence, his generosity and commitment to charitable and philanthropic work as well as public service. His friends and colleagues insist that he is remorseful. I have no reason to doubt that. He's made efforts to make amends. He appears to be truly remorseful.

At the time of the offense conduct, Mr. Pigeon was a political consultant, a lobbyist, and an attorney based in Buffalo. He was also a former elected official and former

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:24PM

03:25PM

03:26PM

03:26PM

03:26PM

03:26PM

03:26PM

03:26PM

Chairman of the Erie County Democratic Committee and well-connected and influential political person in Western New York. He's now lost all of that due to his criminal activity. He was fully compliant with all the terms and conditions of pretrial release.

The parties are well aware of the offense conduct. The Court also notes that he already received a benefit in accordance with the plea agreement. Were he to proceed to trial on the original indictment and been convicted on those charges in the indictment, he would have been exposed to a much higher sentence. As far as the criminal history category is concerned, he pleaded guilty in New York State in supreme court on bribery- related charges. The Court expects the state court will sentence Mr. Pigeon in due course.

Congress crafted the instant statute because of its concerns with foreign financial influences on our country's elections and the potential impact of that influence on the democratic process in the United States. Mr. Pigeon has tarnished his representation by prioritizing the money interest of his client and himself over the country's national interest that I have just described.

The public expects government representatives, including political consultants such as Mr. Pigeon, to act with honesty and integrity; as well as to protect and maintain the interest of citizens for the greater good of the entire community. The

defendant's actions were contrary to established law which has 03:26PM 1 been formulated to promote fairness and public confidence in 2 03:26PM our democracy. 3 03:26PM 03:26PM 4 The Court has sentenced the defendant, in part, to 5 generally deter criminal conduct of this nature as well as 03:26PM 6 jeopardize the credence that citizens place in our system of 03:26PM 7 governance. The political process requires trust and 03:26PM 8 confidence in voters when it makes election decisions. 03:26PM I have imposed a period of supervised release with special 9 03:26PM 10 conditions. I am not imposing a fine. I do not believe he 03:26PM 11 has the ability to pay a fine in view of his tax liabilities 03:27PM 03:27PM 12 that he has pending against him as well as personal debt that 13 he now finds himself with. 03:27PM Mr. Pigeon, you have a right to appeal the sentence, sir, 03:27PM 14 15 if you feel the Court misapprehended its authority or it 03:27PM imposed an illegal sentence; however, you did waive your right 16 03:27PM 17 to appeal. If you feel that waiver is not a valid waiver, you 03:27PM 18 may take that issue before the Second Circuit Court of 03:27PM 03:27PM 19 I will allow for a voluntary surrender at a time and 20 place designated by the US Bureau of Prisons. 03:27PM 21 MR. CAMBRIA: We'd like to have him surrender today, 03:27PM Your Honor, right now. 22 03:27PM 23 THE COURT: All right. 03:27PM 24 MR. CAMBRIA: And we appreciate your consideration. 03:27PM 25 THE COURT: All right. He'll be -- I don't know if 03:27PM

```
1
                there's a marshal in the courtroom. So, he'll surrender today
03:27PM
                to the US Marshals for beginning his service. All right.
            2
03:27PM
            3
                Anything further?
03:27PM
                         MR. KELLER: Your Honor, the government would move,
03:27PM
            4
            5
                at this time, to dismiss Counts 1 through 8 of the original
03:28PM
            6
                indictment in this case.
03:28PM
            7
                         THE COURT: Motion is granted. Court will be in
03:28PM
            8
                         And, counsel, thank you very much for your
03:28PM
                recess.
            9
                submissions. They were very helpful in trying to render a
03:28PM
           10
                fair and just sentence.
03:28PM
           11
                         MR. CAMBRIA: Thank you, Your Honor.
03:28PM
03:28PM
           12
                         THE CLERK: All rise.
           13
                (Proceedings concluded at 3:28 p.m.)
03:28PM
           14
           15
           16
           17
           18
           19
           20
           21
           22
           23
           24
           25
```

1	* * * * * * *
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a
4	correct transcription of the proceedings
5	recorded by me in this matter.
6	
7	
8	
9	s/ Megan E. Pelka, RPR
10	Official Court Reporter
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	